

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 6, 2009. Please reconsider the amended claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 12, 23 and 24 have been amended. Claims 12, 14-24 remain pending in the application as shown above. Reconsideration is respectfully request.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claims 12, 23, and 24 because of certain informalities. In particular, the Examiner contends that the claims recite an incorrect clause: "a fusible wire wound about the core a plurality of windings". Applicant has amended claim 12 and 24 to state that "a fusible wire wound about the core forming a plurality of windings" as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner further contends that claims 23 and 24 recite the terms: "substantially flat" and "relatively flat", respectively and that "the terms produce indefiniteness since the terms are not defined by the claims and the specification does not provide a standard from ascertaining the requisite degree." Applicant has amended claims 23 and 24 to recite that the "insulating fibre has an approximately circular cross section and is configured to deform to a flattened strip when wound about said core." As stated by the Examiner, support for the amendments to claims 23 and 24 may be found in the Specification at Sections [0008] and [0014]. Applicant believes that each of the Examiner's claim objections have been addressed.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner objects the drawings Under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In particular, the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "insulating fiber has a substantially flat cross-section" recited in claim 23, or "insulating fiber configured to have an relatively flat cross section" recited in claim 24 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claims(s). Applicant has amended

claims 23 and 24 to more particularly claim the deformed insulating fibre. In addition, Applicant has added Fig. 2A to illustrate the deformed insulating fiber after winding and also amended the specification as noted above. Support for these amendments may be found at least in Sections [0008] and [0014].

35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US/4,523,172 to Drothen et al. (Drothen). Regarding claims 12, the Examiner contends that Drothen disclosed (Fig.2-3) a fusible conductor for a fuse element, said fusible conductor comprising: an electrically insulating core (6); a fusible wire (7) wound about the core (6) as a plurality of windings; and an electrically insulating fiber (10, 11) wound about the core adjacent to each of said plurality of fusible wire windings such that the insulating fiber is fixed in position adjacent each winding of the fusible wire. In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claim 12 "does not recite that the fusible element is adjacent a fusible wire of a subsequent winding..." Applicant has amended claims 12 and 24 consistent with the Examiner's suggestions. In particular, claims 12 and 24 have been amended to include "an electrically insulated fibre wound about the core and disposed between each of said plurality of fusible wire windings such that the insulating fibre is adjacent a fusible wire of a subsequent winding." In contrast, the fusible element 7 of Drothen is never adjacent a fusible wire of a subsequent winding. Rather, the insulating fiber 10 of Drothen is always adjacent another insulating fiber 10 along each of the windings.

The Examiner rejected claim 24, and alternatively, claim 12 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by, US/3,486,155 to McCaughna. However, McCaughna does not disclose "an electrically insulated fibre wound about the core and disposed between each of said plurality of fusible wire windings such that the insulating fibre is adjacent a fusible wire of a subsequent winding" as recited in amended claims 12 and 24.

35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 14-23 under the 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US/4,523,172 to Drothen taken alone. Since each of claims 14-22 depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not obvious in view of Drothen for at least the reasons stated above.

In view of the preceding remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 12 and 14-24 are traversed and claims 12, 14-24 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner is in disagreement with the above, Applicant respectfully requests the benefit of a telephonic interview. If privilege of an interview is granted, the undersigned may be contacted by telephone. Applicant conditionally petitions for any extensions of time to address the possibility that the need for such extension, not accounted for herein, is required.

Respectfully submitted,

/DANIEL N. DAISAK/
DANIEL N. DAISAK
Registration No. 39,160
Attorney for Applicants

Date: October 6, 2009

DUANE MORRIS LLP
P.O. Box 5203
Princeton, NJ 08543-5203
(609)631-2415 (Telephone)
(609)631-2401 (Facsimile)